



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 10/618,317 | 07/11/2003 | Guolin Ma | 10020800-1 | 4776 |
| 57299 | 7590 | 10/29/2007 | | |
| Kathy Manke Avago Technologies Limited 4380 Ziegler Road Fort Collins, CO 80525 | | | EXAMINER HOLTON, STEVEN E | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2629 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE 10/29/2007 | DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

avagoip@system.foundationip.com
kathy.manke@avagotech.com
scott.weitzel@avagotech.com

| | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. 10/618,317 | Applicant(s) MA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Steven E. Holton | Art Unit 2629 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-8, 12 and 13.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.

AMR A. AWAD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
Amr Ahmad Awad

Continuation of 13. Other: The Examiner has considered the arguments presented with the amendment after final, but finds the arguments not persuasive. As noted by the Applicant, Uemiya et al. (USPN:4762381) discloses an LED light unit embedded within a waveguide. However, Uemiya does not disclose a reflector cup also embedded within the waveguide to direct light towards the output end of the waveguide. Butterworth et al. (USPN: 5847507) discloses an LED light unit that provides a light source (110) surrounded by a reflector cup (120).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that the LED light unit of Butterworth et al. could replace the generic LED light unit disclosed by Uemiya et al. After replacing the embedded LED light unit of Uemiya et al. with the LED light unit of Butterworth et al. All of the elements of the Butterworth et al. light unit would be embedded within the waveguide structure of Uemiya et al. This would include the light source and the reflector cup described by Butterworth. At the time of invention it would have been obvious that the generic LED light unit could be replaced with any known specific LED light unit to provide the benefits of the specific LED light unit. Selecting a specific LED light unit would be a matter of design choice based on color, brightness, power consumption or other factors of the LED light unit. By embedding the LED light unit described by Butterworth et al. into the waveguide using the techniques described by Uemiya et al., a light source and reflector cup surrounding the light source would be embedded within a waveguide. Uemiya clearly shows the light sources being oriented towards an output end of the waveguide and such orientation would place the reflector top to direct light towards the output end of the waveguide.

The reflective cladding described by Uemiya et al. could be used or no longer used when the LED light unit of Butterworth et al. is embedded within the waveguide. The reflective cladding could be used as a secondary reflective surface to help direct more light towards the output of the waveguide, but the light source and reflector cup of Butterworth would still be embedded within the waveguide and would still read on the claims as presented..